	1					
1	BILL LOCKYER, Attorney Go	eneral				
2	of the State of California JEANNE C. WERNER, State I	Bar No. 93170				
3	Deputy Attorney General California Department of Justic	ce				
4	1515 Clay Street, 20 th Floor P.O. Box 70550					
5	Oakland, CA 94612-0550 Telephone: (510) 622-2226					
6	Facsimile: (510) 622-2121					
7	Attorneys for Complainant					
8		BEFORE 7	гне '			
9	CALIFORNIA BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY					
10		STATE OF CAL	JIFORNIA			
11	In the Matter of the Accusation	n Against:	Case No. AC-2004-27			
12	THOMAS ROGER NEAL		DEFAULT DECISION			
13	3043 San Fernand Way Union City, CA 94587		AND ORDER			
14	Certified Public Accountant Certificate No. CPA 74508		[Government Code §11520]			
15		Respondent.				
16						
17		FINDINGS O	F FACT			
18	1. On or about Au	gust 2, 2005, Compla	inant Carol Sigmann, in her official capacity			
19	as the Executive Officer of the	California Board of A	Accountancy, Department of Consumer			
20	Affairs ("Board"), filed Accus	ation No. AC-2004-2	7 against Thomas Roger Neal, Respondent,			
21	before the Board.					
22	2. On or about No	vember 21, 1997, the	Board issued Certified Public Accountant			
23	Certificate No. CPA 74508 to	Thomas Roger Neal,	Respondent. The Certificate is subject to			
24	renewal every two years (on Ju	uly 1 of odd-numbere	d years) pursuant to Business and Professions			
25	Code section 5070.5.					
26	A. The certificate	was expired and not v	ralid during the period July 1, 1999, through			
27	September 15,	1999, because the ren	ewal fee was not paid and a declaration of			
28	compliance wit	h continuing educatio	on requirements was not submitted.			

- B. The Certificate was renewed on September 16, 1999, upon receipt of the renewal fee and declaration of compliance with continuing education requirements in an "active" status.
- C. The Certificate was placed on hold effective January 10, 2000, and Respondent was issued a temporary 30/150-day license pursuant to California Family Code section 17520. On June 14, 2000, that temporary license was suspended, and the Certificate was placed in a "denied" status and was not valid during the period June 14, 2000, through August 31, 2000, pursuant to California Family Code section 17520. The Certificate was released pursuant to California Family Code section 17520 and was returned to an "active" status for the period September 1, 2000 through June 30, 2001.
- D. The Certificate expired and was "delinquent", that is, not valid, during the period July 1, 2001 through August 27, 2002. Effective August 28, 2002, the Certificate was renewed in an "active" status.
- E. The Certificate was placed on hold effective December 25, 2002, and Respondent was issued a temporary 30/150-day license pursuant to California Family Code section 17520. On January 29, 2003, that temporary license was suspended, and the Certificate was placed in a "denied" status and was not valid during the period January 29, 2003, through March 13, 2003, pursuant to California Family Code section 17520. The Certificate was released pursuant to California Family Code section 17520 and was returned to an "active" status for the period March 14, 2003 through June 30, 2003.
- F. The Certificate expired and was not valid during the period July 1, 2003 through August 13, 2003. Effective August 14, 2003, the Certificate was renewed in an "active" status through June 30, 2005, and it is currently renewed in an "active" status through June 30, 2007.
- 3. On or about August 8, 2005, Mary Ann Reeves, an employee of the Department of Justice, served, by Certified and First Class Mail, a copy of Accusation No. AC-2004-27,

Statement to Respondent, Notice of Defense, Request for Discovery, and Government Code sections 11507.5, 11507.6, and 11507.7 to Respondent's address of record with the Board, which was and is 3043 San Fernand Way, Union City, CA 94587. A copy of the Accusation, the related documents, and Declaration of Service are attached as Exhibit A, and are incorporated herein by reference.

- 4. On or about August 9, 2005, the green card receipt for certified mail delivery was returned to the Office of the Attorney General in Oakland by the U.S. Postal Service, signed by "Thomas Neal" on August 9, 2005. The green card is attached hereto as Exhibit B, incorporated herein by reference.
- 5. Service of the Accusation was effective as a matter of law under the provisions of Government Code section 11505, subdivision (c).
 - 6. Government Code section 11506 states, in pertinent part:
- "(c) The respondent shall be entitled to a hearing on the merits if the respondent files a notice of defense, and the notice shall be deemed a specific denial of all parts of the accusation not expressly admitted. Failure to file a notice of defense shall constitute a waiver of respondent's right to a hearing, but the agency in its discretion may nevertheless grant a hearing."
- 7. Three months have passed since service of the Accusation on August 8, 2005. An un-dated, untimely Notice of Defense was received on November 9, 2005 (stamped by DOJ mailroom on reverse). This is attached hereto as Exhibit C, incorporated herein by reference. Respondent has thus failed to file a Notice of Defense within 15 days after service upon him of the Accusation, and has therefore waived his right to a hearing on the merits of Accusation No. AC-2004-27.
 - 8. California Government Code section 11520 states, in pertinent part:
- "(a) If the respondent either fails to file a notice of defense or to appear at the hearing, the agency may take action based upon the respondent's express admissions or upon other evidence and affidavits may be used as evidence without any notice to respondent."
- 9. Pursuant to its authority under Government Code section 11520, the Board finds Respondent is in default. The Board will take action without further hearing and, based on the

documentation) in support of his audit opinion, and there is no evidence that the audit procedures were in fact performed.

- c. Due Professional Care. Respondent's performance of the audit engagement and his preparation of his auditor's report and supplemental Yellow Book report evidenced extreme departures from the GAAS requirement that due professional care be exercised.
- d. Auditor's report. Respondent's certifications, for both the auditor's report and the Yellow Book report, that he conducted the audit in accordance with professional standards were contrary to fact and were not supported by his audit procedures.
- (3) Auditor's Report Violations [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 5062 and 5100(g) and Board Rule 58], in that, *inter alia*, Respondent issued his unqualified audit opinion on the financial statements without complying with professional standards.
- (4) Non-Compliance with Standards [Board Rule 58/Bus. & Prof. Code § 5100(g)] in that Respondent failed to observe professional standards in the conduct of the audit engagement.
- B. In re: *Friends Group Home* Audited Financial Statements FYE June 30, 2001 and 2000 (DSS client):
 - (1) Unlicensed Practice [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 5050/5051/5055 & 5100(g)] in that Respondent's license was expired and in a delinquent status at the time he performed the audit engagement, and when he issued his auditor's reports and caused them to be filed with DSS.
 - (2) Knowing Preparation, Publication & Dissemination of False or Misleading Financial Statements [Bus. & Prof. Code § 5100(j)], in that Respondent, having been contacted by DSS regarding his non-licensed status, re-dated and reissued the reports, using a date on which his license would have

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	C
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	C
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	
2	5
2	.6
2	7
2	· S

been renewed (albeit with no evidence produced regarding completion of qualifying continuing education - see below). Another effect of the redating was that the Respondent employed a date which would have precluded him as auditor, from completing required audit procedures in accordance with professional standards.

- (3) Gross Negligence [Bus. & Prof. Code §5100(c)]. Violations include:
 - a. Unlicensed practice.
 - b. False Report Dates, in that Respondent re-dated his auditor's and Yellow Book reports, representing that in fact the audits were completed and the reports issued on that date when they were not.
 - c. Evidential Matter. Respondent has produced no workpapers (audit documentation) in support of his audit opinion, and there is no evidence that the audit procedures were in fact performed.
 - d. Due Professional Care. Respondent's performance of the audit engagement and his preparation of his auditor's report and supplemental Yellow Book report evidenced extreme departures from the GAAS requirement that due professional care be exercised.
 - e. Auditor's report. Respondent's certifications, for both the auditor's report and the Yellow Book report, that he conducted the audit in accordance with professional standards were contrary to fact and were not supported by his audit procedures.
- (4) Auditor's Report Violations [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 5062 and 5100(g) and Board Rule 58], in that, *inter alia*, Respondent issued his unqualified audit opinion on the financial statements in the absence of compliance with professional standards.
- (5) Non-Compliance with Standards [Board Rule 58/Bus. & Prof.Code § 5100(g)] in that Respondent failed to observe numerous

professional standards in the conduct of the audit engagement.

Several instances of Respondent's failure to timely respond, or to respond at all,

1 2

3

C.

5

6

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

to Board requests for information, including a Board subpoena [Bus. & Prof. Code §5100(g) and Board Rule 52]. (See Accusation, paragraph 42, for particulars.) D.

Failure of Respondent, while engaged in public practice, to provide, as required by continuing education requirements, requested documentation to support his completion of continuing education courses in support of his license renewal in the active status [Bus. & Prof. Code § 5100(g)/Board Rules 87, 89 & 94].

5. It is found, in aggravation of penalty, that Respondent represented himself as a certified public accountant without a valid permit and engaged in the practice of public accountancy while unlicensed. Further, Respondent has personally benefitted from his audit engagements while completely failing in his duty to produce competent audit reports, supported by adequate audit documentation, which would facilitate the appropriate government agencies in performing their responsibilities to assure the delivery of services to vulnerable populations and to ensure that public monies are being appropriately spent. Respondent has demonstrated a total lack of regard for licensing requirements, which are designed to protect the public, in part by the Board's providing continuing education requirement and promulgating and enforcing other standards and requirements which increase the likelihood that licensed practitioners will be competent to provide certain services to the public.

//

//

//

 \parallel

//

//

1					
2	\ <u>\</u>				
3	<u>ORDER</u>				
4	IT IS ORDERED that Certified Public Accountant Certificate No. CPA 74508, heretofore				
5	issued to Respondent Thomas Roger Neal, is revoked.				
6	Pursuant to Government Code section 11520, subdivision (c), Respondent may serve a				
7	written motion requesting that the Decision be vacated and stating the grounds relied on within				
8	seven (7) days after service of the Decision on Respondent. The agency in its discretion may				
9	vacate the Decision and grant a hearing on a showing of good cause, as defined in the statute.				
10	This Decision shall become effective on <u>February 24</u> , 200 <u>6</u> .				
11	It is so ORDERED, 200_6				
12					
13	Ronald Blanc				
14	FOR THE CALIFORNIA BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY				
15	DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS				
16					
17	90029986.wpd				
18	DOJ docket number:SF2004400393				
1:9	Attachments:				
20	Exhibit A: Accusation No.AC-2004-27, Related Documents, and Declaration of Service				
21	Exhibit B: Postal Return Documents Exhibit C: Notice of Defense and Postmarked Envelope				
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
20					

1	BILL LOCKYER, Attorney General							
2								
3	1515 Clay Street, 20 th Floor							
4								
5	Oakland, CA 94612-0550 Telephone: (510) 622-2226							
6	Facsimile: (510) 622-2121							
7	Attorneys for Complainant							
8	BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA BOARD OF ACCOUNTANCY DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS							
9	STATE OF CAI	LIFORNIA						
10	In the Matter of the Accusation Against:	Case No. AC-2004-27						
11	THOMAS ROGER NEAL	ACCUSATION						
12	3043 San Fernand Way Union City, CA 94587							
	Certified Public Accountant Certificate							
14	No. CPA 74508,							
15	Respondent.							
16								
17	Complainant alleges:							
18	PARTIES AND JU	RISDICTION						
19	1. Complainant Carol Sigmann brings	this Accusation solely in her official capacity						
20	as the Executive Officer of the California Board of Accountancy, Department of Consumer							
21	Affairs.							
22	2. On or about November 21, 1997, the	e California Board of Accountancy issued						
23	Certified Public Accountant Certificate Number CPA 74508 to Thomas Roger Neal,							
24	Respondent. The Certificate is subject to renewal e	every two years (on July 1 of odd-numbered						
25	years) pursuant to Code Section 5070.5.							
26	A. The certificate was expired and not	valid during the period July 1, 1999 through						
27	September 15, 1999, because the rer	newal fee was not paid and a declaration of						
28	compliance with continuing education	on requirements was not submitted.						

2
3

, ,

- B. The Certificate was renewed on September 16, 1999, upon receipt of the renewal fee and declaration of compliance with continuing education requirements in an "active" status.
- C. The Certificate was placed on hold effective January 10, 2000, and Respondent was issued a temporary 30/150-day license pursuant to California Family Code Section 17520. On June 14, 2000, that temporary license was suspended, and the Certificate was placed in a "denied" status and was not valid during the period June 14, 2000, through August 31, 2000, pursuant to California Family Code Section 17520. The Certificate was released pursuant to California Family Code Section 17520 and was returned to an "active" status for the period September 1, 2000 through June 30, 2001.
- D. The Certificate expired and was "delinquent", that is, not valid, during the period July 1, 2001 through August 27, 2002. Effective August 28, 2002, the Certificate was renewed in an "active" status.
- E. The Certificate was placed on hold effective December 25, 2002, and Respondent was issued a temporary 30/150-day license pursuant to California Family Code Section 17520. On January 29, 2003, that temporary license was suspended, and the Certificate was placed in a "denied" status and was not valid during the period January 29, 2003, through March 13, 2003, pursuant to California Family Code Section 17520. The Certificate was released pursuant to California Family Code Section 17520 and was returned to an "active" status for the period March 14, 2003 through June 30, 2003.
- F. The Certificate expired and was not valid during the period July 1, 2003 through August 13, 2003. Effective August 14, 2003, the Certificate was renewed in an "active" status through June 30, 2005.
- G. The Certificate is renewed in an "active" status through June 30, 2007.

STATUTES AND PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS

- 3. <u>Disciplinary Authority/Unprofessional Conduct</u>. This Accusation is brought before the Board under the authority of Section 5100 of the Business and Professions Code.¹ Code Section 5100 provides, in relevant part, that, after notice and hearing the Board may revoke, suspend or refuse to renew any permit or certificate granted, or may censure the holder of that permit or certificate for unprofessional conduct including, but not limited to, one or any combination of the following causes:
 - (c) Dishonesty...(or) gross negligence in the practice of public accountancy.
 - (g) Willful violation of the Accountancy Act or any rule or regulation² promulgated by the board under the authority granted under this chapter.
 - (j) Knowing preparation, publication or dissemination of false, fraudulent, or materially misleading financial statements, reports, or information.
- 4. <u>Audit Report</u>. Code Section 5062 requires a licensee to issue a report which conforms to professional standards upon completion of an audit of financial statements.
- 5. <u>Licensed Practice</u>. As pertinent herein, Code Section 5050 requires that a person be licensed by the Board in order to practice public accountancy in the State of California. Code Section 5055 provides that only a licensed individual or firm may use the "CPA" designation. Code Section 5051 states in pertinent part that a person shall be deemed to be engaged in the practice of public accountancy if he or she does any of the following:
 - (a) Holds himself or herself out to the public in any manner as one skilled in the knowledge, science, and practice of accounting, and as qualified and ready to render professional service therein as a public accountant for compensation.

^{1.} All statutory references are to the Business and Professions Code unless otherwise indicated.

^{2.} Board rules or regulations cited herein are codified in Title 16 of the California Code of Regulations and will be referenced simply as a Board Rule, *e.g.*, Cal. Code Regs., tit.16, § 5 will be referenced herein as Board Rule 5.

- (b) Maintains an office for the transaction of business as a public accountant.
- (c) Offers to prospective clients to perform for compensation, or who does perform on behalf of clients for compensation, professional services that involve or require an audit, examination, verification, investigation, certification, presentation, or review of financial transactions and accounting records.
- (f) Keeps books, makes trial balances, or prepares statements, makes audits, or prepares reports, all as a part of bookkeeping operations for clients.
- 6. Required Observance of Rules. Board Rule 5 requires a licensee to observe Board rules if the licensee is engaged in the types of activities performed by certified public accountants or who renders other professional services which include, but are not limited to, bookkeeping, financial planning, investment planning, tax services and management services.
 - 7. Response to Board. Rule 52 provides in pertinent part that:
- A. A licensee shall respond to any inquiry by the Board or its appointed representatives within 30 days. The response shall include making available all files, working papers and other documents requested. [Rule 52(a)]
- B. A licensee shall respond to any subpoena issued by the Board within 30 days and in accordance with the provisions of the Accountancy Act and other applicable laws or regulations. [Rule 52(b)]
 - C. A licensee shall appear in person upon written notice or subpoena.[Rule 52(c)]
- D. A licensee shall provide true and accurate information and responses to questions, subpoenas, interrogatories or other requests for information or documents.[Rule 52(d)]
- 8. Professional Standards (Audits of Financial Statements and Auditor's Reports).

 Board Rule 58 provides that licensees engaged in the practice of public accountancy must comply with all applicable professional standards, including but not limited to generally accepted accounting principles ("GAAP" see below) and generally accepted auditing standards ("GAAS" see below).³ Standards of practice pertinent to this accusation and the engagements in

^{3. &}quot;Generally accepted accounting principles" (GAAP) are the basic postulates and broad principles of accounting pertaining to business enterprises. These principles establish guidelines for measuring, recording, and classifying the transactions of a business entity. "Generally

issue⁴ include, without limitation:

A. Generally Accepted Auditing Standards ("GAAS") issued by the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA). The ten generally accepted auditing standards⁵ are discussed at some length in the Statements on Auditing Standards ("SAS") and are codified, by "AU" number, in the AICPA's Codification of Statements on Auditing Standards. GAAS include four Standards of Reporting.

(1.) Among the SAS relevant herein are:

AU §150 (Ten Standards; Audit Risk; Materiality);

AU §210 (Training and Proficiency of the Independent Auditor);

AU §230 (Due Care). AU §230.02 imposes a responsibility on the auditor

to observe the standards of fieldwork and reporting;

AU §311 (Planning and Supervision);

AU §316.37 (Documentation of the Auditor's Risk Assessment);

AU §319 (Internal Control) and Appendix A (Control Environment

Factors);

AU §326 (Evidential Matter);

AU §339 (Working Papers), including AU §339A.08 requiring that the auditor adopt reasonable procedures for the safe custody of working

papers; and

AU §508 (Auditor's Report).

21

22

16

17

18

19

20

accepted auditing standards"(GAAS) are the standards prescribed for the conduct of auditors in the performance of an examination of management's financial statements. See *SEC v. Arthur Young & Co.*, 590 F.2d 785, 788 nn. 2 & 4 (9th Cir. 1979).

2324

4. All references herein to standards and other authoritative literature are to the versions in effect at the time the audit engagements were being performed.

2526

5. There are ten basic or fundamental standards, and the Statements on Auditing Standards are, for the most part, devoted to elaborating on those standards. The "basic" standards are codified at AU § 150. Among these ten standards are the three General standards, the three standards of Fieldwork, and the four Reporting standards, all of which are further described in the other SAS's.

28

(2.) GAAS - Specifics re: "Reporting" Standards

- (i.) The **first "Standard of Reporting"** (AU § 150.02) provides that "The report shall state whether the financial statements are presented in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles." This is further defined in AU § 508.08, which provides that the fourth basic element of the auditor's standard report is the inclusion of a statement that "the audit was conducted in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards and an identification of the United States of America as the country of origin of those standards."
- (ii.) The **third "Standard of Reporting"** (AU § 150.02) provides that "Informative disclosures in the financial statements are to be regarded as reasonably adequate unless otherwise stated in the report."
- (iii.) The **fourth "Standard of Reporting"** (AU § 150.02) provides that the "report shall contain either an expression of opinion regarding the financial statements, taken as a whole, or an assertion to the effect that an opinion cannot be expressed...the report should contain a clear-cut indication of the character of the auditor's work, if any, and the degree of responsibility the auditor is taking."
- (iv.) AU Section 508 provides further guidance regarding the relationship of the fourth reporting standard (immediately above) to the language of the auditor's report. The auditor can determine that he is able to issue an audit report containing an unqualified opinion only if he has conducted his audit in accordance with GAAS. AU Section 530 states, in part, that the date of the auditor's report should be the date the field work and corresponding review of events subsequent to the balance sheet date is completed.
- B. <u>Generally Accepted Governmental Auditing Standards ("GAGAS")</u>, set forth in *Government Auditing Standards Standards for Audit of Governmental Organizations*, *Programs, Activities and Functions*, and issued by the Comptroller General of the United States,

United States General Accounting Office, 1994 rev. as amended (the "Yellow Book"). For a "Yellow Book" audit, these standards, in addition to requiring observance of the GAAS requirements set forth above, provide additional requirements, *e.g.*, supplemental working paper documentation requirements, additional reporting requirements (reports on internal control and compliance with laws and regulations), and quality reviews, as set forth hereinafter. Among specific GAGAS standards pertinent herein are, without limitation:

- (1) GAGAS Supplemental Working Paper Requirements: Section 4.34 of Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards ("GAGAS" or the "Yellow Book") requires that a record of the auditors' work be retained in the form of working papers. Section 4.35 provides that "Working papers should contain sufficient information to enable an experienced auditor having no previous connection to the audit to ascertain from them the evidence that supports the auditors' significant conclusions and judgments."
- Oganization conducting audits in accordance with these standards should have an appropriate internal quality control system in place and undergo an external quality control review." Section 3.33 provides that "Organizations conducting audits in accordance with these standards should have an external quality review at least once every 3 years by an organization not affiliated with the organization being reviewed. [footnote omitted] The external quality control review should determine whether the organization's internal quality control system is in place and operating effectively to provide reasonable assurance that established policies and procedures and applicable auditing standards are being followed."
- GAGAS Continuing Education Requirements: Section 3.6 requires, *inter alia*, that each auditor responsible for planning, directing, conducting, or reporting on audits under GAGAS complete, every 2 years, at least 80 hours of continuing education and training, of which at least 24 hours should be in subjects directly related to the government environment and to government auditing. Section 3.7 makes the audit organization responsible for establishing and implementing a program to ensure that auditors meet the continuing education and training requirements set forth in Section 3.6, and requires that the audit organization maintain

documentation of the education and training completed.

- (4) <u>GAGAS Additional Reports Required</u>: Section 5.3 incorporates the reporting requirements of GAAS and prescribes additional standards, including the requirement to report on compliance with laws and regulations (see sections 5.5 through 5.16) and to report on internal controls (see sections 5.17 through 5.25).
- (5) <u>Sixth Supplemental Reporting Standard</u>: GAGAS requires that audit reports are to be submitted, inter alia, to officials who have legal oversight authority or who may be responsible for taking action and to others authorized to receive such reports (Section 5.32).
- C. Other laws and regulations, including those of the California Department of Social Services (CDSS). Among the regulations pertinent herein are CDSS regulations found in its Manual of Policies and Procedures, Division 11, Section 11-405, which regulate group homes' requirements for financial audits. Audits must also meet the Federal Welfare and Institutions Code (see WIC Section 11466.21).
- D. The AICPA *Code of Professional Conduct*, which includes Section I Principles and Section II Rules. Both the Principles (Articles III and VI) and the Rules (Rule 102, rule 501) are relevant to the allegations herein. For example, Rule 102 (Integrity and Objectivity), provides that:

"In the performance of any professional service, a member shall maintain objectivity and integrity, shall be free of conflicts of interest, and shall not knowingly misrepresent facts or subordinate his or her judgment to others."

- 9. Continuing Education Requirements for Licensure and Active Practice.
- A. Board Rule 80 provides that the holder of an inactive license shall not engage in the practice of public accountancy as defined by Code Section 5051.
- B. Board Rule 87 sets forth continuing education requirements for license renewal.
- C. Board Rule 89 requires that a licensee obtain and retain for four or six years (depending upon the credit claimed) after renewal of his license a certificate of completion or its equivalent. The rule provides that the Board may verify such information and require a licensee to make up any deficiency, during which time the licensee shall be ineligible for active status

license renewal. The rule further provides that the willful making of any false or misleading statement, in writing, concerning his continuing education constitutes cause for disciplinary action.

- D. Board Rule 94 provides that the failure, by a licensee engaged in active practice, to comply with the Board's continuing education rules and requirements constitutes cause for discipline under Code Section 5100.
- 10. Pursuant to Code section 118(b), the suspension, expiration, or forfeiture by operation of law of a license issued by the Board shall not, during any period in which it may be renewed, restored, reissued, or reinstated, deprive the Board of its authority to institute or continue a disciplinary proceeding against the licensee upon any ground provided by law or to enter an order suspending or revoking the license or otherwise taking disciplinary action against the licensee on any such ground. Further, Code section 5109 provides, *inter alia*, that the expiration of a license shall not deprive the Board of jurisdiction to proceed with any investigation or action or disciplinary proceeding against the licensee. Code section 5070.6 provides that an expired permit may be renewed at any time within five years after its expiration upon compliance with certain requirements.
- 11. Cost Recovery. Code Section 5107 authorizes the Board's recovery of certain costs which result from the investigation and prosecution of violations of the Accountancy Act.

 Section 5107(a) of the Code provides in pertinent part that the executive officer of the Board may request the administrative law judge, as part of the proposed decision in a disciplinary proceeding, to direct any holder of a permit or certificate found guilty of unprofessional conduct in violation of Section 5100 to pay to the Board all reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case, including, but not limited to, attorneys' fees incurred prior to the commencement of the hearing. A certified copy of the actual costs, or a good faith estimate of costs signed by the Executive Officer, constitute prima facie evidence of reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution of the case.
- 12. Code section 5000.1 provides as follows: "Protection of the public shall be the highest priority for the California Board of Accountancy in exercising its licensing, regulatory,

1		8
2		i
3		
4	l	
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		8
0		I
1		f
2		t
3		f
4		ľ
5		I
6		
7		I
8		C
9		
0.9		f
21		
22		(
23		S
24		ľ
25		

and disciplinary functions. Whenever the protection of the public is inconsistent with other interests sought to be promoted, the protection of the public shall be paramount."

1

1

1:

1

1

26

27 28

FOR CAUSES FOR DISCIPLINE

Angel's YouthCenter - Financial Statement Audit for FYE June 30, 2001 and 2000

First Cause for Discipline - Unlicensed Practice [Bus. & Prof. Code §§ 5050/5051/5055 & 5100(g)]

- 13. On or about May 1, 2002, Respondent issued an audit report resulting from his audit engagement for Angel's Youth Center ("Angel's")⁶. The audit report was issued on Angel's financial statements for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2001 and 2000. This report was filed with the California Department of Social Services ("DSS"). His auditor's report asserted that Respondent conducted his audit in accordance with GAAS and GAGAS, and that the financial statements were fairly presented in accordance with GAAP. Respondent also issued, on May 1, 2002, his report on internal control and compliance with laws and regulations ("Yellow Book report") as required by GAGAS.
- 14. Incorporating by reference the matters alleged in paragraph 2. D. above, Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code Sections 5050, 5051 and 5055 in conjunction with Code Section 5100(g) in that Respondent's license was not valid:
- At the time he performed the audit engagement of Angel's Youth Center's Α. financial statements.
- At the time Respondent issued his auditor's reports on Angel's Youth B. Center's financial statements, and caused the reports to be filed with DSS. Respondent knew or should have known that the reports had to be filed with DSS, and he caused, or permitted, the reports to be filed on or about May 6, 2002, with DSS.
 - 15. Incorporating the matters alleged in paragraphs 13 and 14, cause is established for

^{6.} Angel's Youth Center, Union City, California, is a not-for-profit corporation which receives public monies to support its foster care program. It is required to file audit reports with the California Department of Social Services ("DSS").

the discipline of Respondent's license because Respondent has engaged in the practice of public accountancy and represented himself as a licensed CPA without being duly licensed, that is, while his license was expired and in a delinquent status.

Second Causes for Discipline - Gross Negligence [Bus. & Prof. Code Section 5100(c)]

- 16. Complainant realleges the matters in paragraphs 13 and 14 as though fully set forth.
- 17. <u>License Expired</u>. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Code Section 5100(c) in that his issuance of an auditor's report and a Yellow Book report, representing himself, and signing, as a CPA, during a time when his license was expired, is an extreme departure from professional standards and constitutes cause for discipline of his license.
- 18. Evidential Matter. Although required by GAGAS (and GAAS) to create and maintain workpapers in support of his audit opinion, Respondent has produced no workpapers (audit documentation) in support of his audit opinion. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Code Section 5100(c) in that he failed to document, in audit documentation or working papers, the evidence collected and procedures performed in support of his opinion on Angel's financial statements as expressed in his auditor's report and in his supplemental Yellow Book report. Further, there is no evidence that the audit procedures were in fact performed. These failures constitute extreme departures from applicable professional standards and provide cause for discipline of his license for gross negligence.
- 19. <u>Due Professional Care</u>. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Code Section 5100(c) in that his performance of the audit engagement and his preparation of his auditor's report and supplemental Yellow Book report evidenced extreme departures from the GAAS requirement that due professional care be exercised in the performance of the audit and the preparation of the reports, constituting cause for discipline of his license.
- 20. <u>Auditor's Report</u>. Respondent's certification, in Respondent's audit report for Angel's Youth Center's financial statements, that he had conducted his audit of Angel's financial statements according to GAAS and GAGAS and that the financial statements were fairly

presented according to GAAP, were contrary to fact and were not supported by Respondent's audit procedures. In addition, the assertions in the Yellow Book supplemental report were not supported by Respondent's audit procedures. Respondent caused the issuance of both reports in the absence of compliance with professional standards, constituting, in each case, an extreme departure from those standards.

Third Cause for Discipline -Auditor's Report Violations [Bus. & Prof. Code Sections 5062 and Board Rule 58/5100(g)]

- 21. Complainant realleges paragraphs 13, 14 and 16 through 20, above, and incorporates them herein by reference as if fully set forth at this point.
- 22. The certifications, in Respondent's audit reports for Angel's Youth Center's financial statements, that he had conducted the audits of Angel's Youth Center's financial statements, and issued his reports, according to GAAS and GAGAS, and that the financial statements were fairly presented according to GAAP were contrary to fact and were not supported by Respondent's audit procedures. Respondent caused the issuance of the auditor's report, with his unqualified audit opinion on the financial statements, in the absence of compliance with professional standards. Respondent also issued his Yellow Book report in the absence of compliance with professional standards.
- 23. Incorporating by reference the matters alleged in paragraphs 20 and 21, cause for discipline of Respondent's license is established under Code Section 5062, in conjunction with Code Section 5100(g), for his failures in issuing the June 20, 2001 and 2000 Angel's Youth Center auditor's report and his Yellow Book report.

Fourth Cause for Discipline - Non-Compliance with Standards [Board Rule 58/Bus. & Prof. Code Section §5100(g)]

24. Incorporating by reference the matters alleged in paragraphs 13,16 through 20, and 22, cause for discipline of Respondent's license is established under Board Rule 58 in conjunction with Code Section 5100(g), in that Respondent's conduct demonstrates lack of

conformance to professional standards.

Fifth Causes for Discipline - Unlicensed Practice [Bus. & Prof. Code $\S\S 5050/5051/5055$ & 5100(g)]

25. On or about May 1, 2002, Respondent issued an audit report for Friends Group Home's⁷ ("Friends") financial statements for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2001 and 2000. This report was filed with DSS. His auditor's report asserted that Respondent conducted his audit in accordance with GAAS and GAGAS, and that the financial statements were fairly presented in accordance with GAAP.⁸ In his auditor's report dated May 1, 2002, Respondent referenced his report on internal control and compliance with laws and regulations, required by GAGAS ("Yellow Book"), and referenced *an issuance date of June 29,2001*, (which predated his auditor's report). However, the GAGAS report was filed with DSS at the same time as the auditor's report, and the GAGAS report itself was dated May 1, 2002.

26. Incorporating by reference the matters alleged in paragraphs 2. D. and 25 above, Respondent is subject to disciplinary action under Code Sections 5050, 5051 and 5055 in conjunction with Code Section 5100(g) in that Respondent's license was not valid:

A. At the time he performed the audit engagement of Friends Group Home's financial statements.

B. At the time Respondent issued, on May 1, 2002, his audit reports on Friends Group Home's financial statements and Yellow Book report. Respondent knew or should have known that the reports had to be filed with DSS, and he caused, or permitted, the reports to be filed on or about May 6, 2002, with DSS.

27. Incorporating the matters alleged in paragraphs 25 and 26, cause is established for the

^{7.} Like Angel's Youth Center (preceding footnote), Friend's Group Home receives public monies for its Foster Care programs and is required to file audit reports with DSS. Friends Group Home is a six-bed license facility and its primary purpose is to provide living skills to young males between the ages of twelve and eighteen, with guidance provided by Social Workers and Support Counselor. Friends Group Home qualifies as a Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3) charitable organization.

^{8.} The report included a scope limitation regarding *My Friends*, an affiliate of *Friends Group Home*.

discipline of Respondent's license because Respondent has engaged in the practice of public accountancy and represented himself as a licensed CPA without being duly licensed, that is, while his license was expired and in a delinquent status.

Sixth Cause for Discipline - Knowing Preparation Publication & Dissemination of False or Misleading Financial Statements [Bus. & Prof. Code Section 5100(j)]

- 28. Complainant realleges the matters set forth in paragraphs 25 and 26.
- 29. DSS questioned Respondent regarding his authority to produce and file the audit reports as filed with DSS, that is, to practice public accountancy, in light of Respondent's expired license status. Following the contact with DSS, Respondent again issued his auditor's report for Friends Group Home's financial statements for the fiscal years ended June 30, 2001 and 2000. This report, as well as Respondent's Yellow Book report for his Friends Group Home audit, were re-dated June 29, 2001. These reports were again filed with DSS.
- 30. Incorporating by reference the matters alleged in paragraphs 28 and 29, Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Code Section 5100(j), based upon his re-dating and re-issuing his auditor's report and Yellow Book report, and/or his re-filing with DSS of his redated auditor's report and Yellow Book report. When alerted by DSS to its concern that he was not licensed on the original issuance date, Respondent revised the reports (all re-dated June 29, 2001). This conduct constitutes the knowing preparation, publication, and/or dissemination of false or misleading financial statements, establishing cause for discipline of his license.

Seventh Causes for Discipline - Gross Negligence [Bus. & Prof. Code Section 5100(c)]

31. Complainant realleges the matters in paragraphs 25, 26 and 29 as though fully set forth.

^{9.} As set forth in Paragraph 2, Respondent's license expired on June 30, 2001, thus, had the reports really been issued on June 29, 2001, Respondent would have been licensed. However, as further described herein, dating the report prior to the end of the fiscal year, which was the effect of the re-dating, is unprofessional conduct, including because such a date, in essence, would "cut off" the audit and would preclude the auditor from completing required audit procedures in accordance with professional standards, which required procedures which extend beyond the client's year-end.

- 32. <u>License Expired</u>. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Code Section 5100(c) in that his issuance of an auditor's report and a Yellow Book report, representing himself, and signing, as a CPA, during a time when his license was expired, is an extreme departure from professional standards and constitutes cause for discipline of his license.
- 33. <u>False Report Dates</u>. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Code Section 5100(c) in that his re-dating his auditor's and Yellow Book reports, representing that in fact the audits were completed and the reports issued on that date, is an extreme departure from professional standards and constitutes cause for discipline of his license.
- 34. Evidential Matter. Although required by GAGAS (and GAAS) to create and maintain workpapers in support of his audit opinion, Respondent has produced no workpapers (audit documentation) in support of his audit opinion. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Code Section 5100(c) in that he failed to document, in audit documentation or working papers, the evidence collected and procedures performed in support of his opinion on Friends' financial statements as expressed in his auditor's report and in his supplemental Yellow Book report. Further, there is no evidence that the audit procedures were in fact performed. These failures constitute extreme departures from applicable professional standards and provide cause for discipline of his license for gross negligence.
- 35. <u>Due Professional Care</u>. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Code Section 5100(c) in that his performance of the audit engagement and his preparation of his auditor's report and supplemental Yellow Book report evidenced extreme departures from the GAAS requirement that due professional care be exercised in the performance of the audit and the preparation of the reports, constituting cause for discipline of his license. Further, the date he belatedly purports to have issued his reports precedes the close of the client's fiscal year, which would violate professional standards. Among other things, it would have the effect of precluding the auditor from completing audit procedures as required by professional standards related to reports on financial statements and the auditor's consideration of subsequent events.
- 36. <u>Auditor's Report</u>. The certifications, in Respondent's audit reports for Friends Group Home's financial statements, that he had conducted the audits of Friend's Group Home's

financial statements, and issued his reports, according to GAGAS and GAAS, and that the financial statements were fairly presented according to GAAP were contrary to fact and were not supported by Respondent's audit procedures. Respondent caused the issuance of the auditor's report, with his audit opinion on the financial statements, in the absence of compliance with professional standards. Respondent also issued his Yellow Book report in the absence of compliance with professional standards.

Eighth Cause for Discipline - Audit Report [Bus. & Prof. Code Section 5062]

- 37. Complainant realleges the matters in paragraphs 25, 26 and 29 as though fully set forth.
- 38. The certifications, in Respondent's audit reports for Friends Group Home's financial statements, that he had conducted its audits of Friends Group Home's financial statements, and issued his reports, according to GAGAS and GAAS, and that the financial statements were fairly presented according to GAAP were contrary to fact and were not supported by Respondent's audit procedures. Respondent caused the issuance of the auditor's report, with his audit opinion on the financial statements, in the absence of compliance with professional standards. Respondent also issued his Yellow Book report in the absence of compliance with professional standards.
- 39. Incorporating by reference the matters alleged in paragraphs 37 and 38, cause for discipline of Respondent's license is established under Code Section 5062, in conjunction with Code Section 5100(g), for his failures in issuing the June 20, 2001 and 2000 Friends Group Home audit report.

Ninth Cause for Discipline -NonCompliance with Standards [Board Rule 58/Bus. & Prof. Code Section §5100(g)]

- 40. Complainant realleges the matters in paragraphs 25, 26 and 29 as though fully set forth.
- 41. Incorporating by reference the matters alleged in paragraph 40, cause for discipline of Respondent's license is established under Board Rule 58 in conjunction with Code Section

5100(g), in that Respondent's conduct demonstrates lack of conformance to professional standards.

Failures to Observe Board Rules

Tenth Cause for Discipline - Failure to Respond to Board Requests and Subpoena [Bus. & Prof. Code Section 5100(g)/Board Rule 52]

42. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Board Rule 52 in conjunction with Code Section 5100(g) in that Respondent has repeatedly failed to timely respond to the Board or to respond at all to its inquiries, as follows:

A. <u>Board's Request [9.16.02] and Respondent's Response</u>. In response to a complaint filed by another California regulatory agency, the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), on September 16, 2002, the Board investigator requested that the Respondent provide his response to allegations that he issued an audit report while unlicensed. Respondent was asked to provide copies of the reports and working papers for the subject audit, a description of his practice, a copy of his last peer or quality review, and copies of certificates of completion for continuing education courses taken during the renewal period ending June 30, 2001, and for the subsequent renewal period.

On October 24, 2002, Respondent left a voice mail message requesting a return call. On October 29, 2002, Respondent was unable to take a call from the Board investigator. Respondent left a subsequent message inquiring when he could bring the requested materials to the Board investigator. The Board investigator left a message that it was sufficient to mail the materials. On November 14, 2002, the Board investigator telephoned Respondent's office and was informed that he was out of town until November 25, 2002.

B. <u>Board's Second Request [11.14.02] and Respondent's Response</u>. The November 14, 2002, telephone call was followed by a **second** written request from the Board investigator, dated **November 14, 2002**. The Board investigator called Respondent's office on December 11, 2002, and left a message with the receptionist. On December 12, the Board investigator called Respondent's office and was told by Respondent that he would call her back in about twenty minutes. The Board investigator did not receive a return phone call.

C. <u>Board's Third Request [12.20.02]</u>. A third request for the Respondent's response was mailed to him via regular and certified mail at his address of record on December 20, 2002. No response was received.

D. <u>Board's Subpoena [09.02.03]</u>. No response having been received to its third request, the Board requested that the Respondent appear in person (at the next scheduled Administrative Committee meeting most convenient for Respondent) and produce materials, to respond to its inquiry. On August 14, 2003, the Respondent appeared before a Board Investigative Hearing. Respondent did not bring the materials requested but promised to provide the Board with all information previously requested. Pursuant to an understanding reached during the Investigative Hearing, the Board issued a Subpoena on September 2, 2003, requesting specific information and documents. In addition to that information previously requested, an explanation/clarification was requested regarding the issue dates and revised reports for both audits, and documentation was requested re: the Respondent's enrolled agent status (with the Internal Revenue Service). **No response was received**. The Respondent did not file formal objections, informal objections, or communicate in any manner with Board representatives concerning the subpoena.

Eleventh Cause for Discipline - Failure of Licensee Engaged in Public Practice to Comply with Continuing Education Requirements [Bus. & Prof. Code Section 5100(g)/Board Rules 87, 89 & 94]

- 43. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Board Rule 89 in that Respondent renewed his license effective August 14, 2003 and, as alleged in paragraphs 13 through 15 and 25 through 27, Respondent has engaged in the practice of public accountancy but has failed to provide, as required, the requested documentation to support the continuing education courses he claims to have completed in support of his license renewal.
- 44. Incorporating by reference the matters alleged in paragraph 43, Respondent is subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Board Rule 94 in conjunction with Code Section 5100(g) in that he has engaged in public practice as defined in Code Section 5051 without complying with the Board's requirements for continuing education, including but not limited to the requirements of Board Rule 80 and/or Board Rule 87 and/or Board Rule 89, constituting cause for discipline of his license under Board Rule 94 in conjunction with Code Section

OTHER MATTERS

Cost Recovery

45. Pursuant to Code Section 5107, it is requested that the administrative law judge, as part of the proposed decision in this proceeding, direct Respondent to pay to the Board all reasonable costs of investigation and prosecution in this case, including, but not limited to, attorneys' fees.

Discipline Considerations

- 46. To determine the degree of discipline, if any, to be imposed on Respondent, Complainant alleges, in aggravation of penalty, that Respondent represented himself as a certified public accountant without a valid permit and engaged in the practice of public accountancy.
- 47. It is further alleged, in aggravation of penalty, that respondent has personally benefitted from his audit engagements while completely failing in his duty to produce competent audit reports, supported by adequate audit documentation, which would facilitate the appropriate government agencies in performing their responsibilities to assure the delivery of services to vulnerable populations and to ensure that public monies are being appropriately spent. Further, he has demonstrated a total lack of regard for licensing requirements, which are designed to protect the public, in part by setting education and other standards and requirements which increase the likelihood that licensed practitioners will be competent to provide certain services to the public.
 - 48. Code Section 5000.1 is relevant to the penalty determination in this matter.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Complainant requests that a hearing be held on the matters herein alleged, and that following the hearing, the California Board of Accountancy issue a decision:

1. Revoking, suspending, or otherwise imposing discipline on Certified Public Accountant Certificate Number CPA 74508, issued to Thomas Roger Neal.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

2. Ordering Thomas Roger Neal to pay the California Board of Accountancy the reasonable costs of the investigation and enforcement of this case, pursuant to Business and Professions Code section 5107;

3. Taking such other and further action as deemed necessary and proper.

DATED: august 2, 2005

CAROL SIGMANT Executive Officer

California Board of Accountancy Department of Consumer Affairs

State of California Complainant

SF2004400393 Neal accusation 7 27 05_1.wpd